

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 1-5 and 10-15 have been allowed.

Pending claims 6-9 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,908 (Schmitz). Schmitz is directed to a method for authorizing a user in a data transmission system wherein a user sends a qualifying identification such as a fingerprint code through a data input apparatus together with a request for the generation of a transaction authorization number (TAN) to an authorization computer. The authorization computer generates the transaction authorization number and sends it over a second transmission path different from the first transmission path to a monitor, for example, or a pager so the user sees the TAN. The user reads the transaction authorization number from the pager display and then manually enters it into the data input apparatus that was used to send the user qualifying identification information. (See for example, Abstract and columns 6-8). The TAN is sent so that a user visually sees the TAN on a monitor and then manually enters the TAN. The TAN is not transparent to the user. To the contrary, the TAN is visually displayed on a monitor or pager so that the user sees it.

Applicants claim a different method. For example, as to claim 6, the claim requires, among other things, retransmitting, by the intermediate destination unit, the authentication code to the first unit via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to a user of the first unit. The office action alleges that column 4, lines 1-5 and column 17, line 61-64 teach this subject matter. However, column 4, lines 1-5 actually refers to a first secondary channel between the intermediate unit and the authentication unit. For example, the office action alleges that the authorization computer of Schmitz corresponds to the claimed authentication unit and that the receiver 3 or 4 corresponds to the claimed intermediate unit.

Using these definitions, the cited portion refers to the transmission path "between the authorization computer and the receiver unit" or the transmission path "between the data input apparatus and the authorization computer". Neither of these paths is a secondary channel as used by the intermediate destination unit (the receiver 3 or 4) to retransmit the authentication code to the "first unit via a secondary channel" as required by the claim. Also, the office action does not identify which component in Schmitz allegedly refers to the "first unit", but for purposes of attempting to expedite prosecution, Applicants will assume that it is the data input apparatus 101. If this assumption is not correct, Applicants respectfully request notification of the same. Making this assumption however, the cited portion does not teach that the receiver 3 communicates the TAN to the data input apparatus via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to a user of the first unit as required by the claim. To the contrary, as set forth for example, in column 8, lines 36-47, the receiver includes a monitor and "the user reads this transaction authorization number...from the language or audio output and enters it manually into the data input terminal." As such, the cited portion refers to a manual viewing and entry by the user as opposed to a retransmission via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to that of the first unit as required by the claim. The cited portion of column 7, lines 61-64 also states that the password is placed on the display or monitor of the data input apparatus 1. Again, there is no retransmission by the receiver via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to a user of the first unit. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 8, the claim requires, among other things, receiving the retransmitted authentication code from the intermediate destination unit and returning the authentication code to the authentication unit. The office action cites column 7, lines 61-64 as allegedly teaching this subject matter. However, this cited portion does not refer to returning the authentication code to the authentication unit wherein the authentication code was a

retransmitted authentication code from an intermediate destination unit. In fact, the cited portion does not state that any authentication code is sent back to the authentication unit but to the contrary, merely states that the authorization number can be received by a receiver and displayed on a monitor of the data input apparatus 1 which is the first unit. The cited portion does not state that the data input apparatus 1 returns the authentication code back to the authentication unit as required by the claim. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 16, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 6. Accordingly, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claim adds additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/18/07

By: Christopher J. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kautman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005